



PATENT

6-18-03
#9

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re patent

appln. of: Kosta L. PELONIS

Serial No.: 09/996,842

Filed: November 29, 2001

For: **PORTABLE HEATER**

Examiner: John A. Jeffery

Art Unit: 3742

Att'y Docket: 305-01

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail postage prepaid in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Arlington, VA 22313-1450 on June 9, 2003.

Alex R. Sluzas, Reg. No. 28,669
Dated: June 9, 2003

Mail Stop Fee Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Arlington, VA 22313-1450

RECEIVED

JUN 16 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

RESPONSE

Dear Sir:

This is in response to the Examiner's Action dated March 6, 2003 setting a three-month shortened statutory period for response. A petition for a one-month extension of time for response accompanies this response. This response is being filed on June 9, 2003, within the extended shorted statutory period.

Claims 1-7 are pending in the present application.

Applicant gratefully notes that the prior rejection of claims 1-7 entered over other art has been withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 2,075,323 ("Woolley") in view of U.S. Patent 4,870,253 ("De'Longhi"). This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested.

The Examiner notes that Woolley discloses a covered, sealed radiator heater comprising a plurality of tubular radiator units and fans 18 positioned above the radiator units for directing air onto the radiator units' upper portions enhancing thermal convection, citing to Fig. 1 and page 1, col. 2, lines 27-42.

The Examiner notes that the claims differ from the previously cited prior art in calling for the heater to be portable. The Examiner states that portable radiators are well known in the art as shown by De'Longhi, particularly pointing to col. 1, lines 5-10 where an electrically-heated mobile radiator with diathermal fluid is disclosed so that the heater can be transported to different rooms.

The Examiner concludes that in view of De'Longhi, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a mobile radiator in lieu of the fixed radiator of Woolley so that the heater can be transported to different rooms thereby heating only desired rooms.

The Examiner's conclusion is not correct.

As previously noted in response to the initial Examiner's Action in this matter, Woolley discloses a conventional steam radiator 15 shrouded with a casing 20 and having a cover 17 on top in which are installed a plurality of electric motor-driven fans 19 for directing air downward between through the radiator 15.

The Examiner's characterization of Woolley is mistaken. Woolley does disclose a "sealed" radiator unit in the sense of that disclosed by De'Longhi or that of the present invention. The heating radiator 15 disclosed by Woolley "may be a part of an ordinary type of heating system, supplied with a suitable heating system such as steam" (page 1, col. 2, lines 8-9). Utility doors 30 can be provided to provide access to supplied fittings such as a shut off valve 15a and a steam trap 15b (page 2, col. 2, lines 6-13). Woolley's radiator operates in the conventional manner, in the sense that the diathermal fluid, such as steam, is circulated to and through the radiator by conventional means at a location remote from the radiator. The radiator

within Woolley's radiator cabinet is not sealed with respect to the passage of diathermal fluid.

This is an important difference.

There is no reason to believe that cooling the exterior of the radiator enclosed in Woolley's radiator cabinet by circulating air over exterior would enhance the circulation of diathermal fluid within the radiator. Indeed, the diathermal fluid passes through the radiator and does not circulate within the radiator. Steam enters one end, cools on the interior surfaces of the radiator to liquid water, and the liquid water is collected and withdrawn from the other end of the radiator. Consequently, Woolley would not provide one of ordinary skill in the art with any motivation to modify De'Longhi's portable radiator in the manner suggested by the Examiner. Further, the combination suggested by the Examiner would defeat De'Longhi's expressed purpose of producing a uniform air circulation so as to eliminate the difference in temperature between the lower region proximate the floor of the room and the region proximate the ceiling thereof (col. 1, lines 42-48). In the combination suggested by the Examiner, the temperature difference between the floor and the ceiling of the room containing the Examiner's hypothetical portable heater would be exacerbated because the air flow is directed from the top of the radiator cabinet. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection entered are respectfully requested for these reasons.

The Examiner further states that the claims differ from the previously cited prior art in calling for an electric heating element within the sealed radiator. The Examiner notes that providing an electric heating element within a sealed radiator is conventional and well known in the art as evidenced by De'Longhi, noting electric heater 4 within the sealed radiator in Fig. 1 so that the diathermal fluid is heated within the radiator as compared to heated at a remote location. The Examiner further states that by providing an *in situ* electric heater, the radiator fluid can be heated, yet still be portable to transport to other rooms.

The Examiner concludes that in view of De'Longhi, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide an electric heater in lieu of a centralized, remote heat source of Woolley so that the fluid is heated within the radiator thus enabling portability to transport the radiator to other rooms.

This conclusion is incorrect.

Providing Woolley's radiator cabinet with an *in situ* heater would not make it portable. Woolley's invention is intended for use with a conventional steam radiator, well-known in the art to constitute a very heavy object. Combined with Woolley's radiator cabinet and multiple air circulation fans, as well as the source of heat hypothesized by the Examiner, a conventional steam radiator would be anything but portable because of its great weight.

Further, the combination of the two references cited by the Examiner simply does not provide applicant's presently claimed invention. The new combination proposed by the Examiner does not meet limitations of the present claims, and no *prima facie* case is established thereby. To the extent that they can be combined, the resulting device would have a fan underneath the thermal units (De'Longhi) as well as fans above the thermal units (Woolley). Only by making an improper reconstruction of applicant's invention does the Examiner select the fans above the thermal units and discard the fan below the thermal units of the hypothetical device resulting from the combination suggested by the Examiner. Similarly, only by making an improper reconstruction of applicant's invention does the Examiner discard two of the three fans disclosed by Woolley.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection entered are respectfully requested for this reason also.

The Examiner further states that the claims differ from the previously cited prior art in calling for a centrifugal fan. The Examiner also states that centrifugal fans in portable radiators is conventional and well known in the art as evidenced by De'Longhi noting col. 4, line 22.

The Examiner concludes that in view of De'Longhi, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a centrifugal fan in the previously described apparatus so that a blower was used that requires relatively small space yet has a high airflow rate thus facilitating portability.

The Examiner's conclusion is not correct. Merely substituting a centrifugal fan for the conventional fans illustrated in Woolley would not make the combination of the conventional steam radiator disclosed in Woolley and the Woolley radiator enclosure portable. Further, if the substitution were made, there is nothing in either reference to disclose or suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art that such a centrifugal fan be provided above the thermal units as in the presently claimed invention rather than below the thermal units such as disclosed in De'Longhi.

The Examiner also states that the claims also differ from the previously cited prior art in calling for the electric motor driving the fan at low rpm.

The Examiner asserts that it is well known in the art that the speed of the fan in heat radiators is directly proportional to the convective heating effect. That is, the Examiner explains, driving a fan at higher speed will result in a greater convective heating effect as compared to lower speeds, citing Woolley on page 2, lines 19-28, as disclosing driving a fan in conjunction with a radiator for heating a room at reduced speed.

The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a reduced fan speed setting in the previously described apparatus so that a reduced convective heating effect was achieved thereby avoiding overheating of the space to be heated.

This conclusion does not render applicant's presently claimed invention obvious. There is nothing in either of the cited references nor in the combination thereof to motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to select the speed of the fan in order to reduce fan noise, an object of the present invention. Further, providing a variable speed fan as suggested by the Examiner to

avoid overheating the space to be heated would not meet the requirements of the presently claimed invention. The fan of the present invention must be "effective to cool the upper portions of the tubular units to enhance the thermal convection of the diathermal fluid" according to claim 1. There is no reason to believe that the simple relationship between the fan speed and the extent to which the room is heated would obtain in the heater of the present invention, because increasing the fan speed would appear to simultaneously increase heat transfer from the surface of the tubular units and possibly decrease thermal convection of the diathermal fluid within the units as the surface was brought to a more uniform temperature by virtue of the increase air circulation.

The Examiner further states that regarding claims 5 and 6, no criticality is seen in the specific motor rpm values, and that it is well settled that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation, citing In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233,235 (CCPA 1955). The Examiner also notes that courts have held that even if "applicant's modification results in great improvement and utility over the prior art, it may still not be patentable if the modification was within the capabilities of one skilled in the art, unless the claimed ranges 'produce a new and unexpected result from which is different in kind and not merely in degree from the results of the prior art,'" citing In re Huang, 100 F.3d 135, 139, 40 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1685 (Fed. Cir. 1996).

The Examiner concludes that in the present case, one of ordinary skill in the art would know that reducing the motor speed would correspondingly reduce the airflow rate of the fan (citing to page 2, col. 2, lines 19-29 of Woolley) and the specific rpm values claimed are within the scope of routine experimentation by one of ordinary skill in the art.

This is not correct. The cited art does not disclose or suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art that a fan should be provided to cool the upper portions of the tubular units in order to enhance the circulation of diathermal fluid. Consequently, the prior art does not disclose or

Serial No.: 09/996,842
June 9, 2003

suggest the variable that the Examiner hypothesizes is being optimized. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested for this reason.

As the application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, early favorable action and an early notice of allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Alex R. Sluzas
Registration No. 28,669

Paul and Paul
2900 Two Thousand Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Telephone (215) 568-4900
Fax (215) 567-5057

June 9, 2003

Order No.: 1498